## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

| HARRIS CORPORATION,                                    | )<br>LEAD CASE                     |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Plaintiff,                                             | ) LEAD CASE                        |
| i iuiitiii,                                            | CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-cv-00439-JRG |
| v.                                                     | )<br>)     JURY TRIAL DEMANDED     |
| HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC., HUAWEI                        |                                    |
| DEVICE CO., LTD., HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA INC., HUAWEI |                                    |
| TECHNOLOGIES CO. LTD., AND                             |                                    |
| HUAWEI DEVICE (SHENZHEN) CO.,                          |                                    |
| LTD.                                                   |                                    |
| Defendants.                                            | )<br>)                             |

## NOTICE REGARDING DEFENDANTS' RULE 12(b)(6) MOTION TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

On March 8, 2019, Huawei moved to dismiss the Amended Complaint for failure to state a claim, alleging that all claims of the patents-in-suit are patent-ineligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Dkt. Nos. 31, 40, 41, and 48. Via a separate notice filed on April 4, 2019, Huawei limited its motion to the claims then asserted. Dkt. 47. In addition, pursuant to the Court's Standing Order Regarding Motions Under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the parties filed a joint letter concerning the parties' disagreement about whether claim construction was necessary to inform the Court's decision regarding the subject matter eligibility of the asserted claims. Dkt. 37. In that letter, Huawei asserted that there were no claim construction disputes requiring resolution. Dkt. 37-1 at 6-7.

On July 12, 2019, Huawei served its Proposed List of Terms and Claim Elements Requiring Construction. Huawei identified 127 separate terms from Harris's Asserted Claims for

construction. See Exhibit A.1 Huawei's list included proposed terms encompassing each and every one of the Asserted Claim terms originally identified by Harris in connection with briefing on the 101 Motion. Dkt. 37-1 at 4-5; Exhibit A. For example, Huawei asserted in Dkt. 37-1 at 7 that "add[ing] a plurality of encrypting bits" was known in the art. Huawei asserted in Exhibit A at 11 that "encrypting bits" and "by at least adding a plurality of encrypting bits to both the address and data information" require construction by the Court.

Harris respectfully requests that the Court consider Exhibit A in conjunction with its decision on Huawei's Motion to Dismiss—which Harris has argued should be denied, including because fact and claim construction issues remain for resolution. See, e.g., Dkt. 37-1 at 4-5; Dkt. 40 at 4: Dkt. 48 at 8-9.<sup>2</sup>

Dated: July 16, 2019 Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Corey Johanningmeier

Henry C. Bunsow Denise De Mory Christina Finn **Robin Curtis** Corey Johanningmeier Nicolas Mancuso **BUNSOW DE MORY LLP** 701 El Camino Real Redwood City, CA 94063 Telephone: (650) 351-7248

Facsimile: (415) 426-4744

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Harris's corresponding list identified eleven terms from among the Asserted Claims of Harris's seven asserted patents. With respect to Huawei's five counterclaim patents, Huawei identified nine terms (Exhibit A at 12-13) and Harris identified thirteen.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Harris acknowledges that this Court's standing order permits a defendant to propose claim terms for construction even after taking a position that no construction is necessary for section 101 purposes. Accordingly, Harris does not object to Huawei now proposing terms for construction. But Huawei's change in approach to claim construction provides additional reason that its section 101 motion should be denied.

hbunsow@bdiplaw.com ddemory@bdiplaw.com cfinn@bdiplaw.com rcurtis@bdiplaw.com cjohanningmeier@bdiplaw.com nmancuso@bdiplaw.com

S. Calvin Capshaw
State Bar No. 03783900
Elizabeth L. DeRieux
State Bar No. 05770585
CAPSHAW DERIEUX, LLP
114 E. Commerce Ave.
Gladewater, TX 75467
Telephone: 903-845-5770
Email: ccapshaw@capshawlaw.com
Email: ederieux@capshawlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff HARRIS CORPORATION

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was filed electronically in compliance with Local Rule CV-5(a) with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system.

Dated: July 16, 2019

By: <u>/s/ Corey Johanningmeier</u>

Henry C. Bunsow Denise De Mory Christina Finn Robin Curtis Corey Johanningmeier Nicolas Mancuso BUNSOW DE MORY LLP 701 El Camino Real Redwood City, CA 94063 Telephone: (650) 351-7248 Facsimile: (415) 426-4744

hbunsow@bdiplaw.com ddemory@bdiplaw.com cfinn@bdiplaw.com rcurtis@bdiplaw.com cjohanningmeier@bdiplaw.com nmancuso@bdiplaw.com

S. Calvin Capshaw State Bar No. 03783900 Elizabeth L. DeRieux State Bar No. 05770585 CAPSHAW DERIEUX, LLP 114 E. Commerce Ave. Gladewater, TX 75467

Telephone: 903-845-5770 Email: ccapshaw@capshawla

Email: ccapshaw@capshawlaw.com Email: ederieux@capshawlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff HARRIS CORPORATION